SWEET BRIAR COLLEGE
3 2449 0314167 1

THESIS
HN
143.5
.C85
1973

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
Lyrasis Members and Sloan Foundation

http://www.archive.org/details/migrationsocialr00culb

SWEET BRIAR COLLEGE LIBRARY
SWEET BRIAR, VA. 24595

MIGRATION AND SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS AMONG GUATEMALA CITY DOMESTIC SERVANTS: REFLECTIONS ON THE RURAL AND URBAN TYPOLOGIES.

by

Roberta Anne Culbertson

Date: May 4, 1973

Approved:

H. C. Pearson
Thesis Adviser

Outside Reader

A Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree with Honors

in Major Subject Sociology

Sweet Briar College

Sweet Briar, Virginia

May, 1973

Archives
HN
143.5
.C85
1973

MIGRATION AND SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS AMONG GUATEMALA CITY DOMESTIC SERVANTS: REFLECTIONS ON THE RURAL AND URBAN TYPOLOGIES.

by

Roberta Anne Culbertson

Date: May 4, 1973

Approved:

_____
Thesis Adviser

_____
Outside Reader

_____

A Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree with Honors

in Major Subject

Sweet Briar College

Sweet Briar, Virginia

May, 1973

Much general discussion of modernization and social change refers to two quite common terms - "rural" and "urban". They are convenient categories for general reference and application, and seem to point up a significant difference in the world today - there are "urban" areas and "rural" areas within the same nation, there are "urbanized" and still largely "rural" nations, at least according to frequent usage of the terms. Yet upon close examination or attempts at strict application of the words "rural" and "urban" to empirical situations, problems arise. What exactly is "rural"? What is "urban"? If one thinks of rural as referring to villages and country life, and of "urban" as referring to city life, what does one do with empirical data that seem to indicate that what one classes as "rural" patterns may occur in the city as well? It is the purpose here to attempt, through an examination of certain prominent descriptions of the meaning of "rural" and "urban" and of some relevant empirical data, to perhaps clarify at least one aspect of the meaning of "rural" and "urban". That is, to what extent do the terms "rural", and "urban" correlate with or correspond to the physical and social entities of "village" or "countryside", and "city", respectively. In order to do so, however, one must first examine the meanings of "rural" and "urban" as often used. Here, the works of Robert Redfield and Louis Wirth provide basic information with which to operate. Both established some of the first and most-discussed descriptions of the terms, and both have been criticized as regards the point stressed above.

Redfield's main concern was with the "rural" end of things. To Redfield, "rural" societies vary in themselves, but all to some degree

exhibit an approximation to an ideal "rural" type. In the tradition of the ideal type then, Redfield abstracted a number of physical, social and cultural criteria against which societies could be measured and classed as more or less "rural". He defined such an ideal-type society as:

> small, isolated, nonliterate, and homogeneous, with a strong sense of group solidarity. The ways of living are conventionalized into that coherent system which we call "a culture". Behavior is traditional, spontaneous, uncritical, and personal; there is no legislation or habit of experiment and reflection for intellectual ends. Kinship, its relationships and institutions, are the type categories of experience and the familial group is the unit of action. The sacred prevails over the secular; the economy is one of status rather than of the market. (Redfield, 1947, p. 293)

Implicit in such a description were two things - (1) a description of an "urban" ideal type as the logical opposite of the "rural" (2) a continuum running from "rural" to "urban", along which actual societies would fall as "more" or "less" "rural" or "urban". Redfield made this concept of the continuum explicit, referring to the (of course) "Rural-Urban Continuum".

Lewis Wirth stressed "urban" factors, created an "urban" ideal type and again implied "rural" as the logical opposite of "urban".

Wirth's ideal type of the city consists basically of three main criteria: "(a) numbers of population, (b) density of settlement, (c) heterogeneity of inhabitants and group life..." ("Urbanism as a Way of Life", in A. Strauss, The American City; a Sourcebook of Urban Imagery p. 364) These three criteria result in other factors:

(1) A city, as an area of large population, is by this very fact more prone to diversity. "The personal traits, the occupations, the

cultural life, and the ideas of the members of an urban community may, therefore, be expected to range between more widely separated poles than those of rural inhabitants." (Ibid., p. 365)

(2) Further, "The bonds of kinship, of neighborliness, and the sentiments arising out of living together for generations under a common folk tradition are likely to be absent or, at best, relatively weak in an aggregate the members of which have such diverse origins and backgrounds." (Ibid.) In such a situation, mechanisms of formal control take the place of "the bonds of solidarity" that hold rural societies together. (Ibid.)

(3) Again, large population and diversity is accompanied by a segmentalization of roles; urbanites are "dependent upon more people for the satisfactions of their life-needs than are rural people ... but they are less dependent upon particular persons, and their dependence upon others is confined to a highly fractionalized aspect of the other's round of activity." (Ibid., p. 365) That is, the face-to-face contacts of the city, while face-to-face, "are nevertheless impersonal, superficial, transitory, and segmental." (Ibid.) Such factors as these "make intelligible, also, the sophistication and the rationality generally ascribed to city-dwellers." (Ibid.)

(4) Population density "reinforces the effect of numbers in diversifying men and their activities and in increasing the complexity of the social structure." (Ibid., p. 366) Moreover, the presence of numerous individuals in close contact with one another results in a situation in which "physical contacts are close but our social contacts are distant." (Ibid., p. 366)

(5) "The close living together and working together of individuals who have no sentimental and emotional ties foster a spirit of competition, aggrandizement, and mutual exploitation." (Ibid., p. 367)

(6) The heterogeneity of the urban population occurs as a result of the size of the population, the extensive division of labor in the city, and the social distance and anonymity of city life. Yet in itself as well, heterogeneity has a number of effects on the members of a city population: "The heightened mobility of the individual, which brings him within the range of stimulation by a great number of diverse individuals and subjects him to fluctuating status in the differentiated social groups that compose the social structure of the city, tends toward the acceptance of instability and insecurity in the world at large as a norm..." (Ibid., p. 367)

While Wirth states a number of other factors of urban life, these provide one with a general picture, and with sufficient data for comparison with Redfield's "rural" ideal type.

Yet a degree of overgeneralization and confusion in these ideal types, as they have been understood at least, has resulted in severe criticism of these descriptive "rural" and "urban" typologies, and of the concomitant "rural-urban continuum". These criticisms are made on the basis of a number of cross-cultural empirical studies. The gist of certain of such criticisms is that both Redfield and Wirth tied the physical, geographical, and social entities of "countryside" or "village" and "city", respectively, too closely to their ideal types of "rural" and "urban". Tax and Lewis, for example, state that "urban" elements as Wirth defines them and Redfield

intimates them can be found in the "countryside" or "villages", and that, conversely, "rural" elements can be found in cities. Thus the two question the validity of a rural-urban continuum based on physical and social entities that do not seem to correlate with other elements of the rural and urban ideal types.

Perhaps the difficulty here lies in an unfortunate lack of clarification of terms on the part of all concerned. Perhaps certain other factors need to be introduced to clarify the concepts "rural" and "urban", "village" and "city". Could it be that the connection or correlation between the four terms has not been sufficiently analyzed or factored out? It seems that one might ask, in fact, does the term "rural" encompass the physical and social entity of the village, and does the term "urban" encompass the physical and social entity of the city?

An area of empirical research that provides fruitful data for the answering of questions concerning the meaning of "rural" and "urban" is that of internal migration -- that process by which inhabitants of villages move to cities and set up a new existence there. Such migrants often tend to keep ties with the villages from which they came, going there on vacations, visiting relatives from the village, sending income to family members there. Thus such migrants experience two life-styles, associated, according, to the "rural-urban continuum", with basically "rural" and basically "urban" patterns as presented by Redfield and Wirth. Yet though they experience them, to what extent do these migrants live such life-styles? Does one coming from the village to the city experience a transition of sociocultural patterns and behavior from "rural" patterns to "urban" ones? Does he come to lead an "urban" way

areas can be traced. That is, to get back to the question of migrants in the city; can the presence of sociocultural patterns called "rural" in the city, an "urban" area, be traced to some form of contact with specific villages? Is the presence of "rural" or "urban" factors then at least somewhat tied to contact, or the lack of it, with actual villages and/or cities? If so, then the above criticisms leveled against the "rural" and "urban" typologies result from lack of clarity in terms used by all involved. If such confusion can be cleared away, perhaps the typologies will prove to be somewhat valuable.

Problem

The following study attempts to broach the questions presented by such considerations on a fully empirical level. Such an attempt involves two things: (1) the determination of a set of specific questions that will when answered provide at least a basis for the consideration of those more general questions of the rural-urban continuum just discussed, and (2) the selection of a group of migrants to be studied, who will indicate something of their experience of the transition from village to city life and from "rural" to "urban" life.

Thus out of the above general problem come four more specific questions that attempt to deal with it:

(1) When a migrant moves from the village to the city, what factors of "rural" life as defined by Redfield, seem to consistently be manifested in his life in the city?

Thus one poses a question involving one aspect of the "rural-urban continuum", the question of "rural" sociocultural patterns and their appearance in the city.

(2) When a migrant moves from the village to the city, what factors of "urban" life does he seem to consistently display?

Thus one poses the other side of the question involving one aspect of the "rural-urban continuum", the question of "urban" sociocultural patterns and their appearance in the city in the life of a previous "rural" dweller.

(3) When a migrant moves from the village to the city, does he keep ties, in the form of social relationships with his village of origin?

Here the purpose is to concentrate on the second consideration - that of the relation of "rural" and "urban" to village and city.

(4) Can the maintenance of social relationships with the village of origin and/or the non-establishment of social relationships in the city be correlated in any way with the existence of "rural" factors in the life of a migrant now in the city?

(5) Can the establishment of social relationships in the city, and/or the non-maintenance of social relationships with the village, be correlated in any way with the existence of "urban" factors in the life of a migrant now in the city?

The last two questions then, bring us back to the original consideration in full: the meaning of "rural" and "urban" and the presence of such factors as they may relate to the existence of village and city influences or contacts.

There are a number of factors involving the formulation of these questions that perhaps should be mentioned. First, one must be aware that in speaking of a village as "rural" - one is likely to assume that the city and contacts with it have not brought "urban" patterns to the village. This is not so - and the degree to which a migrant is, in coming from the village, already not definable as "rural" in a sense very closely representing the Redfieldian ideal type must be taken into consideration in any empirical study. The following study attempts to provide some insight into village life as it is - both in its "rural" and in its city - influenced urban aspects. The point is, however, that regardless of "urban" inroads, the very size, density, relative isolation, relative homogeneity,

and occupational structure, of the village is different; it cannot be and is not like that of the bigger, denser, greatly more cosmopolitan, heterogeneous, and diversified city. Those aspects of "urbanism" that appear in the village are adapted to the nature of the village. It is this difference that is considered here. Secondly, it may be noted that a great deal of emphasis has been placed on the use of social relationships as indices of village and city contact. There are two reasons for the selection of this variable for the present study: (1) Social relationships, when conceived of as observable interaction between individuals, are observable in a way that attitudes, beliefs, and points of view are not, and (2) Cooley, Meade, and others point up that men seem to modify their behavior in terms of one another. One's conception of reality, one's values, one's behavior generally, correspond to those of the group with which he has most extensive association. Thus the discovery of a correlation between social relationships with the village and "rural" or "non-urban" factors on the part of the migrant might be further traceable to this basic aspect of human interaction. As the study here is limited to simply the correlation between social relationships in the village and city, and the presence of "rural" and "urban" factors, the more social psychological features of the situation are not analyzed here. Yet this basic premise is the theoretical basis for the use of social relationships in the present study of "rural" - "urban", village - city differences.

One other problem should be dealt with here. Redfield, and Wirth to a degree as well, were dealing with the "rural" and "urban" ideal types in terms of type of community or aggregate of individuals, rather than as types of behavior as observed in individuals. The present study does deal

with individuals, with migrant workers now in the city. How can one apply criteria established with reference to groups, to individuals? The individuals here observed are observed in their existence in and relationship to a community or aggregate of individuals, a village or a city. As such, we may expect that the same criteria applicable to the aggregate or group as a whole will be applicable to the group's or aggregate's members as they interact with the group or the aggregate. Thus it seems valid to observe these migrants in terms of these "rural" and "urban" typologies.

A study to provide elementary and basic information for a general consideration of the problem here presented, that of the relation between the physical and social entities of village and city, and the ideal-typical models of the "rural-urban" continuum, was undertaken in January 1973. The study was intended to provide neither an answer, nor a final statement concerning the questions raised. It was, rather, aimed at discovering areas of possible exploration of the problem, at delimiting variables to be considered in a more extensive analysis of the questions posed. Such aims nevertheless, demanded an empirical situation for their fulfillment: Migrants from the villages of Guatemala to Guatemala City, working as domestic servants in the homes of upper and middle class city-dwellers, were chosen for the study presented here.

Why Guatemala City, and why domestic servants? Guatemala City, while convenient to the researcher, also receives yearly a great in-migration from the countryside. It is a rapidly-growing city, but has insufficient industry to provide employment for all migrants in that area. Thus entrance into unskilled or semiskilled personal service occupations, such

as domestic work, are common. Guatemala City provided then, both information on migrants and on domestic workers specifically.

The domestic servant is himself an interesting object of study, for he has a unique position among migrants. The domestic servant, especially when he lives in the house where he is employed, lives a life different from that of other migrants. There are a number of limitations placed on the servant by virtue of the nature of his job; such limitations provide a basis from which to study this migrant and his response to the village-to-city move. Thus we have now narrowed the consideration of village -- city, "rural" -- "urban" to migrant workers, and specifically, to migrants working as domestic servants in Guatemala City.

The domestic servant may be defined as a man or woman of virtually any age (there are domestic servants as young as eight and ten, and as old as fifty-five to sixty) who works in the house of another for a set wage. He/she receives payment daily, weekly, or monthly, depending on the kind of work he/she does. There are a number of kinds of domestic work available, divided on the basis of sex. Of those positions held by men, there are four: gardener, houseboy, mayordomo, and chauffer. Men who are gardeners; trimming, mowing, planting, and watering the gardens of an employer. Such activity usually remains entirely outside the house, is generally part-time, and does not involve interaction with other servants. The gardener works for a number of employers at one time, and wears what he wants on the job. Younger men, generally adolescents, work often as houseboys, doing all-around chores in the home; cleaning windows, dusting and cleaning the downstairs, watering gardens, washing floors, waxing and polishing furniture and silverware. This is generally a full-time job,

and therefore is with one employer at a time. While the houseboy must look "descent", he does not necessarily wear a coat and tie, or a white shirt on the job. He is not responsible for the actions of other servants. The most prestigious and highly-paid job of those open to men, and in actuality, of all domestic jobs, is that of mayordomo, or butler. If there is no houseboy, he may do a number of houseboy tasks, but also serves tables, serves guests, orders the kitchen and other servants, coordinating their activities. He generally wears black pants, a black bow tie, and white shirt, at all times, and a white jacket when serving. The mayordomo's work is full-time; he may live at the place of employment, or come to work from his own residence. He thus works for one employer at a time.

The jobs of houseboy and gardener can merge in one individual, and those of houseboy and mayordomo may do the same. One does not, however, often find the mayordomo doing the digging and "dirty work" of the gardener, though he may water the plants. Thus one sees a hierarchy based on the nature of work done, the responsibility for others that the work entails, and the location of the work; primarily in or out of the house, and in varying proximity to the employer himself, running from the gardener at the bottom, to the houseboy, to the mayordomo. The pay scale, giving low wages to the gardener, and high wages to the mayordomo, seems to support this hierarchy.

Men may work as chauffers, but this seems to be a job quite different from the other three. The operation of a car tends to place the chauffer out of the class of other domestic workers -- he does not clean or wash or serve the employer; he operates a machine for him. The job seems to carry a high status, much separate from that of others.

Women generally work at one of four occupations, though these are hierarchically arranged, and women may move from a lower to a higher status and higher-paying job. There are first, adentro's, meaning literally "within's", that is, those who work as cleaning girls in the house, and as all-around helpers. They may clean only the upstairs if a houseboy or mayordomo works in the house, if one does not, she is responsible for cleaning the downstairs as well. Generally, she makes beds, cleans bedrooms, sweeps, dusts, and vacuums. She may do some wash, take care of children, or do a little cooking, but these are not her main jobs. She may serve tables or cocktails if there is no mayordomo, if he is on a day off, or if she is needed for a large party.

The cook carries a great deal of prestige. She may prepare the food only, or she may wash only the pans she cooks in, and not the dishes used by those who ate her cooking. The adentro most often does this. She may be helped in food preparation by the adentro. She knows a number of recipes and may decide the menu on her own, or prepare what the employer requests. She does the shopping for some or much of the employers food - though meats and expensive items are often bought by the employer (the employer here is considered the woman of the house - the wife in the family for whom the servant works). She may live at her place of employ, or travel to and from her own or rented home. She works for one employer at a time, is responsible to no one but the employer (though frequent power and authority, struggles may occur between her and the mayordomo), and dresses generally as she pleases. While she talks to the employer informally in planning, when she does her job itself, she is remote from the employer. This is an added status factor. She works where the employer

does not go, (ideally, the employer does not cook) and her work and her presence with the employer are separate. She, like the adentro, is payed monthly.

The washer woman, like the gardener, lives out - she generally works at different houses on different days. She receives payment every time she comes or once a week. She washes and irons the clothes brought to her from the upstairs by the adentro, who then returns them. She may do odd jobs to help the cook or adentro as well. She remains physically separate from the employer, generally wears what she wants and only rarely is called on to help in table service as the adentro does. One who is a laundry or washer woman does not often become an adentro or a cook. She usually washes because it is not a full-time job. She can wash 2-3 to 5 days a week, whatever suits her needs and capabilities, while the cook and adentro work full-time, that is, 6 days a week from early morning until after dinner at night. Often a laundry woman has a family or other job and cannot afford the time a full-time job demands, regardless of the better pay involved in a full-time job.

Some homes hire nursemaids; whose duty is primarily to the family's younger children - bathing, playing with, disciplining, fetching from school. Such work often involves adentro work as well; the two jobs are likely to merge.

The adentro earns a lower monthly wage than the cook and the nature of her job is such that she is below her. The washer woman is in rather of a nebulous position for she works in closer proximity to the other servants, often helping them out, than does the gardener and yet like him, works part-time and is paid by the job or the week. She seems to be, however, about equal to the adentro in status.

Such is the basic typology of domestic jobs and the servants who perform them. As indicated, however, there is a great deal of overlap in positions, and in homes where the servants all "live in", cooperation and sharing of tasks may prove essential to the maintenance of peace and pleasant interpersonal relationships among people who must live near one another, sharing bathrooms, eating utensils, food, and possibly rooms.

It was mentioned that servants may live at the home where they are employed. If this is the case, they often do not rent or purchase a place of residence other than the house where they work. They have, that is, no property in the city. Most upper and middle class homes have a living section behind the kitchen - including a bath and bedrooms, the number and degree of comfort and luxury depending upon the size and luxuriousness of the house itself. Eating and most living outside of the work done in the main part of the house is done in the kitchen. Live-in servants are granted one afternoon-one day off per week, and some take alternate Sundays at the discretion of the employer. Those who often live in are those employed full-time, the adentro most commonly, the houseboy and the mayordomo and cook, less commonly than the adentra but more commonly than the washer woman. Thus one who "lives in" rarely has contact with the world outside the place of employ. The cook when she goes shopping, or the mayordomo, or houseboy when sent on an errand, may get out of the house and into the city but even such contact is brief and done under the aegis of the house. Those who live in have their food, or money for its purchase, provided them by the employer. Furniture, though possibly scanty is also provided. They often receive soap, toilet paper, linens, and uniforms as well. If they have good relations

with their employer, the women may receive second-hand clothes from the family for whom they work. The men receive such gifts less frequently. The result is that the salary of the live-in servant is basically free - it is above and beyond room and board. Thus a servant can often have a higher final income than a worker who must pay for those things the servant receives free of charge. Training for servant work takes place on the job - there is no formal training undertaken.

The live-in servant, except for his or her day off, has no set work and rest hours. He or she is always at the beck and call of the employer. The servants' concerns must be secondary to those interests of those they serve - doctor's appointments, trips to visit nearby relatives, holidays to be taken off, all must be checked and okayed by the employer as fitting into the family's plans.

Life in the "servants' quarters" is generally one of close physical proximity. Most servants are, when coming into a household, strange to one another and must learn to cope with each other in thia close situation. Disagreements break out, and life can become unpleasant - one may be ostracized, made the servant of the others, or otherwise sanctioned. On the other hand, friendship and romantic ties can develop among servants that can serve in good stead in a servants' job market dependent upon connections with other servants. Such ties can also however create difficulties, if for example, men with families, but who live-in without them, may develop romantic ties with women they work with, ties that conflict with those of the family outside the place of employment.

Yet in terms of the questions posed, the factor of live-in servant life most important to the study is that of social isolation: for as

mentioned, while the servant lives in the city, and works for a family who has been successful in the city is therefore probably quite "citified", he does not in actuality participate in the city; he remains at the house, his days-off are few, his contacts with others outside the home where he works are also few. He has no completely free time in which to explore on his own (except again on his day-off - this often becomes in actuality only an afternoon). Unfamiliarity with the city then itself limits servants' interaction with it, and encounters with the numerous factors of city life become few.

On the other hand, the servant must know something of city life to survive: he rides buses, applies for and gets jobs, buys some clothes if not all, gets about on his day off. But what social relationships do such activities involve? Are they qualitatively different from other relationships one might have had in the village? Does the isolation presented possibly determine the existence of certain social relationships and not others? That is, one might say, is the nature of the live-in servant's job such as to make his realm of possible and actual social relationships different from those of the part-time, live-out servant.

The servant who lives out may be employed as any kind of domestic worker. However, the long hours of the houseboy, mayordomo, cook, and adentro, may make it necessary that these live-in. Thus most commonly, part-time workers, such as gardeners and washer women, live elsewhere than in the houses where they are employed, and less commonly, houseboys, mayordomos, cooks, and adentros may do so as well. What are the deciding factors in the decision to live in or not will be important in this study, as such may indicate contacts or the lack of them with parts of the city outside the home of employ.

The servant who lives out must obviously live somewhere else in the city.- in a small house, a small apartment, a room; alone, with members of the family of orientation, with members of the family of procreation, or with friends. Such a living situation already exposes him to a great deal more of the city than the live-in servant receives. He must buy his own food out of his wages, buy his own furniture, his own toiletries, towels and linens. He must pay for daily transportation to and from work. Thus the worker who lives out experiences greater contact with the city than does his live-in counterpart.

The servant who lives out may work shorter hours than the one who lives in, and at any rate is, of necessity, not on call at all times. He is usually not so closely associated with those servants who are live-in (if there are any in the houses where he is employed), simply by virtue of the fact that he is in their presence less of the time. His social relationships with the servants he deals with then, are more limited than is the case among live-in servants. One may consider it possible that he may have more social relationships outside the home of employ and connected with life in the city <u>as</u> a city-dweller than will the live-in servant.

The question now becomes then, does this difference between "live-in" and "live-out" domestic servants provide a possible basis for an approach to the questions of this study? It seems that it does, that the questions posed can be fully operationalized in the following manner:

> If one can speak of one category of migrants to Guatemala City, domestic servants, and, in turn, of two sub-categories of domestic servants, "live-in" and "live-out", can one then ask (1) Are certain "rural" factors found to exist in the life of the domestic servant in the city?

(2) Are certain "urban" factors found to exist in the life of the domestic servant in the city?

(3) If the above are the case, can one discover differences in the presence of "rural" and "urban" factors between those servants who "live in" and those who "live out?"

(4) Do the social relationships of those servants who live in differ in any significant fashion from the social relationships of those who live out?

(5) Can correlations be drawn between the two categories of domestic servant, "rural" and "urban" factors, and the loci of social relationships? This [last] question addresses the more theoretical questions:

> (a) Can the maintenance of extensive social relationships with the village of origin, and/or the non-establishment of social relationships with the city, be correlated with the existence of "rural" factors in the life of the domestic servant?
>
> (b) Can the establishment of extensive social relationships in the city and/or the non-maintenance of extensive social relationships with the village of origin be correlated with the existence of "urban" factors in the life of the domestic servant?

What we ultimately aim at here, then, is a greater understanding of the place of social relationships with the physical and social entities of "village" and "city" in the elucidation of the ideal constructs "rural" and "urban". We use the different social

relationships (if such can be found) characteristic of two structurally different occupational categories, those of "live-in" and "live-out" domestic servants as the basis of comparison. That is:

(6) Can one say that social relationships play a significant role in the whole question of the existence of "rural" and "urban" factors?

The Study

The study undertaken involved thirteen domestic servants - twelve women and one man. Of these, nine are live-in (including the man), and four are live-out servants. Of those who live in, one, the man, is a mayordomo, six are adentros, one is a full cook, and one works alone as a cook and adentro. Of those who live out, all four were washer women, working for two to three houses per week. While one can question the validity of this sample, it is again stated that the purpose here is not to find answers, but to suggest further areas of study on this problem.

These were interviewed in depth over a four week period in Guatemala City. Life histories, descriptions of the village of origin, activities in the city, trips to the village, social relationships in the village and city, feelings about the village and city were all discussed in a free conversation method, guided by a few comments or questions from the interviewer, who stated her purpose as discovering the differences between village and city life. All data were written as presented to the interviewer, and sorted in light of her more specific questions later.

The Study

Hypotheses

Janet Abu-Lughod has done work on domestic servants in Cairo, as they compare with other migrants living in migrant neighborhoods in the city. In speaking of live-in domestic servants, she says,

> "domestic servants...where housing is provided...or... who remain unmarried or leave their families in the village... [Form a group that, while] exposed most intensively to a completely new physical environment, is least assimilated to Cairo. A lifetime spent in sections of the city which contrast sharply with the village environment affects a superficial sophistication unmatched by the manual laborer from the Delta living in a quasi - rural district. It seems, however, that the very lack of gradual transition and of the mediating influences of family and neighborhood has the reverse effect of prolonging the period when one is a stranger. This type of migrant often completely rejects urban life, confining his periodic social contacts to co-villagers often in his own profession and his "real" life to infrequent sojourns to his village family." (Janet Abu-Lughod "Migrant Adjustment to City Life: The Egyptian Case" in The City in Developing Countries: Readings on Urbanism and Urbanization, ed. by Gerald Breese, Princeton University, Prentice Hall, N.J., p. 385)

On the basis of Abu-Lughod's study, as well as on the well-known work of Lewis and Tax, one might hypothesize the following:

(1) The domestic servants will be found to demonstrate certain "rural" factors, though to what extent and in what ways may differ among domestic servants.

(2) The domestic servants will be found to demonstrate certain "urban" factors, though to what extent and in what ways may differ among domestic servants.

(3) The presence of "rural" and "urban" factors as described above will differ between those servants who live in and those who live out, as Abu-Lughod indicated.

(4) With regard to the question of social relationships, two things, Abu-Lughod's findings and the structural features of the live-in and live-out domestic jobs, point to the possibility of significant differences in the social relationships of each of the two mentioned sub-categories.

(5) With regard to the last questions considered (questions five and six), one might expect that among the largely isolated live-in servants, social relationships with other city-dwellers outside the house of employ will be limited, and that there will be more extensive social relationships with the village of origin, while among those servants who live out, social relationships with other city-dwellers will be more extensive than is the case with live-in servants, and social relationships with the village of origin will be more limited than is the case with live-in servants.

(a) Again, in terms of the work done, one might expect to be able to make correlations indicating that those with limited social relationships in the city, and with more extensive social relationships with the village of origin, that is, the live-in servants, would exhibit more "rural" factors as so classified by Redfield.

(b) On the other hand, one might find correlation between more extensive social relationships in the city, and/or the non-maintenance of extensive social relationships with the village, that is, those servants who live out, and the more "urban" factors as so classified by Wirth.

In sum then, one might expect to find that social relationships play an important role in the existence of "rural" and "urban" factors in the lives of village to city migrants.

In one case, the other member of this dyad exhibited schizophrenia
while an independent rater in the reference of "social" and "asocial" behavior
in the lives of schizophrenics.

Observations

It was discovered that certain "rural" factors do exist in the lives of live-in and live-out domestic servants, and that the nature of and the extent to which these factors exist differs from situation to situation. A number of Redfield's indices are presented below, with what evidence was discovered to support them.

Redfield talks of traditional, non-rational behavior as characteristic of "rural" communities. To an extent, such behavior was found to be characteristic of some domestic servants. Yet it must be remembered that these servants and their families live very close to the starvation level. They must behave rationally (in the sense of maximizing gains), to a degree, at least, in order to survive at all. Still, they do engage in behavior that is not rational in the Western economic sense. Some of those interviewed had quit jobs in the city when their employers had refused to allow them time to return home for holidays. Another quit a very high-paying job in the city to return to the village to do a year's duty in the church's women's cofradia (religious sodality). The same woman refused to take a job that required that she live at some distance from a village friend, although she had no other job offer at the time. Others send money home as contributions to the town's fiestas. All of these activities seem classifiable as Redfieldian "traditional", non-rational behavior.

To take another index of "rural-ness" as established by Redfield, the existence of extensive and extended kinship ties: Many exhibited extensive association both with members of the immediate family of orientation, and with aunts, cousins, and grandparents. No uncles were mentioned

as the subjects of visits, recipients of wages, or sharers of households, as were those mentioned above. Many received their first jobs in the city from relatives, and many visited these or other relatives on their days off. Further, Redfield spoke of the family as the "primary unit of action" in the "rural" situation. Emphasis on kinship ties for employment, for support in hard times, sending wages home, and visitation of kin all seem to point to this family orientation as characteristic of domestic servant life in the city. A further indication of the above is the live-out servant's residence with other members of his family, even when all are mature. All may work in different places and at different occupations, but pool resources and supply mutual aid, especially if one becomes old, unemployed, or maimed. Thus again, city domestic servants exhibit "rural" characteristics.

In the city, according to Wirth, the degree of specialization is such that in order to carry out the simplest life functions, a great number of people are needed -- store-owners, employers, produce growers, product producers, produce and product distributors, plumbers, landlords, builders, the list is virtually endless. Such is not the case in Redfield's "rural" ideal construct. Here, dependence on a few people, who are at once kinsmen, producers, distributors, salesmen, cooperative builders, is common. In the city, the bare necessities of life, as indicated, demand interaction with a greater number of people. In the case of the domestic servant, particularly the one who lives in, however, such interaction is nevertheless still limited. The domestic servant receives a number of the necessities of life from one person, his employer. If he lives in, he receives food, housing, uniforms, and toilet articles; if he lives out, he receives

uniforms, and possibly other benificences the employer cares to give. Further, if he lives in, he goes about in the city only limitedly, on days off, or on errands. Emotional needs are satisfied through contacts with kinsmen, who may also help one to find employment, put one up when one is out of work, finance one's trips "home", or help one with wedding plans. Thus a few ties do a number of things in the domestic worker's city life, especially if he lives in. This aspect of city life seems to fall into Redfield's "rural" scheme -- domestic servants indicate "rural-ness" with regard to lack of specialization and role-segmentalization as well.

Perhaps the most complex feature to deal with however, is what Redfield and Wirth both call "group solidarity". Do domestic servants living in the city exhibit signs of group solidarity, or do they not?

Redfield speaks of "group solidarity" as an index of "rural-ness". Yet if one considers a "group" as a number of persons both integrated and interacting, as indicative of social ties uniting such persons, how can one operationalize "group solidarity" for this specific situation? Three indices of group solidarity were decided upon for this purpose: (1) frequent visits among a set of people, (2) participation in Holy Day ceremonies, trips to an area of common membership, e.g., a village, and (3) indications of friendship and mutual aid within a set of individuals.

Many servants often visit family members or more distant kin. They return to their villages of origin for Holy Days - the town's fiesta week and patron saint's day, Christmas, New Year's, and Decoration Day (November 1). Some, usually those whose villages of origin are quite far from the city, form groups based on common village membership, holding their own

fiestas, choosing their own "village" queens, and generally lending mutual support while in the city. In one case, for example, those from Tejutla, near the Western border of Guatemala, have a Guatemala City organization of Tejutlecos, who celebrate the town's saint's day and fiesta week in Guatemala City. Most servants stated that friendships were hard and risky to make in the city, and quite often referred to the village as the source of their true and lasting friendships, though the friends there gained might now live in the city as well.

Thus, in terms of group solidarity, it does seem that domestic servants in the city do exhibit strong association with a group through visiting and through participation in solidarity-emphasizing fiestas. It also seems that these group ties most often lie with those of the same village.

Redfield spoke of the solidarity group as "small, isolated, and homogeneous." At first glance it seemed that such factors did not pertain to the groups of the domestic worker. However, upon examination of the elements of group solidarity as discussed above, certain aspects of small, socially isolated, homogeneous groups became visible. This was especially the case with those servants who live in, who do form with their relatives small, isolated, and homogeneous groups. While domestics, particularly those who live in, may not live near those with whom they share group membership, there may nevertheless be much visiting among them, much travelling to a mutual village of origin, much emphasis on being of a certain town, and like others from that town. The ties of familiarity characteristic of the geographically isolated town continue in the city, where, while domestics are physically separated, they remain socially cohesive, and socially isolated from the city about them. All of this

seems to be tied to a common identification with a village from which all at one point came, and to which all at some times return.

The emphasis above has been on the live-in servant for the simple reason that the live-out servant's situation is quite different. Here, emphasis on belonging to a group, participation in ceremonies or church organizations, visiting of members of the village, and the degree of contact with the city are all different. There is little association with people outside of the family of procreation, no association with neighbors, and little emphasis on or evidence of participation in groups of any kind. There is little or no participation in ceremonies, church organizations, and little or no visiting of friends from the village, the neighborhood, or elsewhere, and a great deal more contact with the city, simply by virtue of the fact that live-out servants, as discussed, must deal with the city more often. There are thus virtually no traces of the "small, isolated, homogeneous" aspects of "rural" life as here described.

We come then to the second question, that is, do domestic servants exhibit certain "urban" factors? The above sketch of live-out servants indicates that some do, and also points up the answer to the third question posed, that is, are there differences in the presence of "rural" and "urban" factors between live-in and live-out servants? But to return to the second question before going on to the third in more detail.

We switch now from Redfield to Wirth, whose ideal type of the "urban" way of life is more explicit than that of Redfield. With regard to the question of traditional versus "urban", rational, goal-oriented, instrumental ways of behavior, it has been indicated that servants do exhibit

rational behavior, but that such behavior is to an extent absolutely essential to survival in the village or the city. Still, one does see evidence of rational behavior as Wirth considers it. Three women mentioned hopes to go to school to learn sewing, child care, or secretarial work in order to land higher-paying jobs. All stated as a basic reason for moving from the village to the city the desire for a better standard of living, "a few more cents (here one must remember the initial caution in the determination of the urban-ness of this factor)." Another quit a job with an aunt, who had brought her to the city, for a higher-paying job in a strange household. One also spoke disparagingly of those servants who quit work in order to return home for fiestas. Further, one situation was found in which a young woman went against her older brother, the obvious authority figure in her situation, to take a job as a domestic servant to earn more money rather than go to school and spend it, as her brother had suggested. Lastly, when asked about use of leisure time, most said they did not go to movies or museums because it took time and money. One said "if I take my day off to go to the movies with my family, I spend money, and I don't make any. On the other hand, if I work as a caterer on my day off, I earn money to place on improvements on my new house, for my children and their school needs." Thus while some may spend money in a traditional fashion, as discussed, others re-invest to the extent that they can. Regardless of the spending end of things, however, they do seem to attempt to maximize economic gains.

The maintenance of extensive kinship ties with the family of orientation seemed to be the rule in the case of the live-in servant. Yet

there was some variation, and the situation of the live-out servant was quite different, for in some cases association with members of a nuclear family of procreation overrode any considerations for other kin. Ties with this nuclear family of procreation then, did seem to correlate with low emphasis on other, more extended kinship relations, a characteristic of Wirth's "urban" life.

Simply because they live in the city, domestic servants must have some experience with specialization and role segmentalization. Again, we might expect the servant who lives out to come into more contact with this facet of city life -- going to and from work, renting or at any rate living in a flat or home with a number of initially strange neighbors (who tend to remain so), buying food, clothing, and the like. Even the live-in servant must interact with bus drivers, store-owners and salesmen. Such interaction involves being more than just a servant; it involves being a bus-rider, renter, buyer, and at the same time not necessarily being a servant. Moreover, servants, by virtue of the different occupations available to them, perform specialized tasks as cooks, butlers, adentros. They are in the household servants, and not fathers, mothers, sisters, farmers, or anything else. While they may have affective ties with the employer, they are nevertheless always treated as servants. Thus we see specialization and segmentalization of roles as factors of "urban" life that the domestic servant, simply by virtue of his presence in the city, adopts.

With regard to the last factor considered here, group solidarity, the degree of "urban-ness" present in the life of the domestic servant has already been dealt with to some degree. To reiterate and expand for the sake of clarity and order, however, group solidarity differs in the

city situation, and does seem to decline in the case of the live-out worker. We have seen in this case an emphasis on the nuclear family and a dissociation from more extended kinship ties, a greater degree of specialization, segmentation of roles and face-to-face contacts, little or no association with members of the village of origin, or with other city groups, political parties, servants' unions or church organizations. Thus among some domestic servants, most notably, those who live out, group solidarity is low and therefore "urban". Without the existence of a group, "smallness" and "homogeneity" have no meaning. Isolation may exist, but it is not isolation of the group so much as of the individual or of the nuclear family. Those who live in flats or houses do not mix with or become close to neighbors, but rather remain suspicious of them and anxious to keep them at a social distance. Thus again we see a close approximation of the Wirthian ideal type.

It should have become increasingly obvious through the last section that the answer to the third question posed is "yes" - that there are differences in the presence of "rural" and "urban" factors between those servants who live in and those who live out. Briefly, those who live in exhibit more "rural" factors, while those who live out exhibit more "urban" factors.

In more detail, however, one must touch on the various "rural" and "urban" factors discussed.

"Traditional" behavior was more common among live-in servants, who sent money home for celebrations and who quit jobs in order to return to the village. Yet it was also the case that two who live in talked of

wishing to further their careers, and that the one who disobeyed her brother lived in as well. There seems to be a discrepancy then, in what was first indicated, and these latter facts. It is with this sort of problem that the question of social relationships is able to deal with. Thus we will return to this point later.

Kinship trends are more clear cut. Those who live in seem to keep extended kinship ties and to associate with the family of orientation. Those who live out seem to deal with a nuclear family of procreation solely. Nevertheless, in both cases, the family unit is the unit of action, a Redfieldean "rural" trait. It has been clearly demonstrated that live-in servants experience a lower degree of role segmentalization than do those who live out and who deal with the city in more ways than does the servant who lives in. The same is true of face-to-face contact: working and resting only in the house of employ, the live-in servant experiences less contact with others than does the live-out servant. Group solidarity has been sufficiently discussed to need no further elaboration here.

Thus, in terms of "rural" and "urban" factors as Redfield and Wirth deal with them, we have a definite distinction between those who live-in and those who live-out. There are, of course, a few questions, but more light will be shed on them in the next section.

As regards the more difficult question of subjective views of the city, however, a problem arises for it seems that, with regard to this aspect, time in the city is at least one important factor. The question of social relationship enters here too, however, and the question of values is thus best left to the latter sections.

With this much established, we can now move into the fourth question presented, that of social relationships in terms of their kind and loci.

Much of the "rural" and "urban" typologies deals with the kinds of social relationships supposedly characteristic of villages and cities, as was evident in the preceding section. However, as should also be evident, the typologies did not cit the actual situation, that is, "rural" factors were found to exist among a certain group of city dwellers. Why this is so takes us back to the original problem presented; what exactly is the relationship between "rural" and "urban" and the physical and social entities of "village" and "city"? One hopes that possibly some light can be shed on the question with the following consideration as also previously presented, can one find a correlation between the presence of "rural" and "urban" factors and the maintenance of social relationships with the concrete entity of village, or city? We have already noted a definite difference in the lives of live-in and live-out servants, that is, that live-out servants possess more social relationships with the city and fewer with the village.

Yet the problem is more complex than this. One might speak of "extensive" social relationships here - meaning a number of social relationships - be they based on affectivity (such as those of family and kinship) or affectively neutral (such as these involved in buying, renting, and selling in the city). Here we are simply concerned with the locus of the majority of one's social relationships.

The concern here becomes then, does the locus of one's primary and secondary relationships correlate with the existence of "rural" and "urban" factors. If one's affective relationships lie in the village of origin,

or with those from the village of origin, and if one's affectively-neutral relationships are more limited, is one more "rural"? On the other hand, if one's affective relationships lie in the city, and if one's affectively-neutral relationships are more numerous, is one more "urban"?

What one hopes to find in the end is the answer to the question; if one finds "rural" factors, are they correlated with an actual physical and social village? If one finds "urban" factors, are they correlated with extensive contact with the actual physical and social city?

Thus far we have considered primarily interaction, social variables, with little or no emphasis on the value, or if one wishes, the "cultural" end of things. In other words, we have seen how the domestic servant acts, but how and what does he think? What values, what subjective measurements, does he place on village and city life respectively? Redfield and Wirth deal with this question rather indirectly in the information presented here on the two men's views. Nevertheless, we can expect that an emphasis on the validity and "goodness" of village life, and more specifically, remembrances of it, will indicate at least something of a still "rural" emphasis. In general "urban" dwellers tend to look with a degree of condecension on the backward, ill-educated and poorly informed country dweller. On the other hand, however, they often construct an idyllic "rural" life that combines the best of both "urban" and "rural" life. Yet they also seem most frequently to put this idyllic "rural" world either in the past, or in a dreamlike, unreal setting. The contention here is that the village dweller moved to the city may idealize his youth - but he still keeps social ties with a particular village, and refers to "rural" life as he remembers it in a specific situation. That he finds value in it is an indication

of a certain amount of "rural"-ness, and not of the "urban" sophisticate's idyllic rural world or the past or fantasy. We can possibly find support for this view, and for its concomitant - that those who live in the urban area and speak of its positive values are speaking from experience and possibly then from a different angle than do those who live in the village and romanticize "urban" life - in the work done on immigrants to the United States. Gans (Urban Villagers 1962) for example, and Robin Williams as well (1970) speak of first-generation immigrants as keeping old country customs and a view to the old country alive, while those of the second-generation (here meaning the children of the immigrants) tend to reject such a view in favor of a more "urban" or at least American view of things. It is thus with the idea that a positive emphasis on village life indicates a "rural-ness" in the domestic servant; and that a positive emphasis on city life and possible deprecation of "village life indicates a degree of "urban-ness", that we approach the following data.

All domestic servants place positive value on the informal social controls characteristic of village life as they know it. There, men and women are honorable, locks and even doors are unnecessary. Stealing does not occur for two reasons: (1) there is nothing to steal, and more importantly (2) people simply do not have it in them to steal from others. Socialization is such that children learn discipline at an early age, sometimes in hard ways, through bouts with severe corporal punishment with moral lessons. One woman told of how her hair ribbons were stolen by a girl at school when she was young. The woman's mother beat her with a leather switch for not taking care of her ribbons, and went with her to school the next day to demand the ribbons from the robber. The robber

was chastised by the mother, who also told the school teacher. Thus "the girls career as a robber was short-lived", she said, "and so it was that all in the town grew up in honesty."

Servants contrast such situations with the impersonal, formal controls of city life which seem largely ineffective. Here there are robbers, cheaters, servants who steal from employers and make it hard for others to get jobs, servants who steal from or frame other servants, making it risky at times to seek friends on the job. There are street robbers as well - women will not go out after dark. Men in the village could walk about at all hours, free from fear, but not so in the city. Men are killed for a few cents in their pockets when they leave the house for a pack of cigarettes. Further, the police are largely ineffectual; in the village, one knows the police and the police know the village citizens - they can quickly apprehend any wayward lawbreakers, and care about the people they protect and serve. In the city, one sees a policeman once and then possibly never again. The policeman has no interest in one's misfortune, and rarely sees a case all the way through. Thus if one is robbed or injured, there is little chance for justice. The city then, leads to a precarious existence on the edge of violence, loss of life, and property, and at the same time, to formal and therefore largely ineffectual control, protection, and justice. It must be remembered that such is how the domestic servant currently in the city sees his situation. Whether this is actually the case or not does not concern us here. What is important is the obviously positive value placed on village life.

Domestic servants speak of the village in positive terms in another context - that of the cost of living. In the village, one need not pay

for electricity, one uses candles and goes to bed early. One needn't pay for cooking gas, one uses wood cut from a private or communal woodland. One needn't purchase water - it is free at the local well. One can build one's own house from available and often free materials, one needn't pay rent. Further, one needn't buy all one eats - one can grow some vegetables, some corn and beans on a small plot of land, and cut down considerably on food bills. Thus in sum, living is cheaper in the countryside, domestic servants say.

Yet if this is the case, why do they come to the city? Here appears the city's positive value; there are work and wages here, something not available in many villages. Village life involves tedious manual labor - on farms, in home crafts, - child bearing and the responsibilities and chains of marriage. Often there is no work, there is drought, there are too many children, there are animal and plant diseases. Life is gruelling, filled with sickness, hunger, and even boredom. The city provides an answer to these problems - by offering jobs less gruelling and demanding, more steady and continuous, by offering a predictable, expectable set wage - there is always some coming in if one has a job. This security is not present in the village where hard work on a crop may go the way of a blight or of a dry growing season. The problem of boredom, however, continues, the domestic's life is dull they say. While the city has of course a number of options, entertainments, and activities to offer, most do not take advantage of such things, for the lack of money and time.

In sum then, domestic servants in the city seem to exhibit both a "rural" and an "urban" emphasis with regard to their subjective views of things. The village is both good and bad, and the city is both good and

bad. Yet one notes that overall, the city is "good" to the extent that it provides work and wages, but that the more emotive factors - freedom from fear, honesty, honor, are equated with the village. This did not seem to differ with regard to live-in and live-out servants, both categories presented the same views. It did however, change with time spent in the city, those who had been there longest, or who had been there from earliest childhood, referred to the goodness of village life not at all, but rather to the goodness of city life, saying that one can find good people in the city, that one receives kindness to the degree that he gives it, regardless of whether one is in the village or the city. Possibly then, these more subjective aspects of the "rural"-"urban" question are among the last to change in the process of movement into the city. Whether this is so or not will be better determined after the presentation of data on social relationships.

Relationships with members of the family of orientation still in the village were most common among those servants who live in. Relationships in this case were determined by the visiting or not visiting of such family members. Of those who live in (nine in all), all but two go back to the village to visit mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, or guardians who raised them. Of the two that do not, one (called Mari Nere) has, in cooperation with her two brothers, brought her parents and a younger sister to the city, and set up a house for all of them. She now has only one married sister in the village of origin. The other who does not visit relatives in the village (referred to here as Loti) is basically from Guatemala City. She came here when very young; her father died after a

long illness that left her mother destitute. Her mother came to the city for work, leaving all but her young daughter forever. Ties with the village since have been nil.

Of those studied who do not live in (four in all), none visit those of their families of orientation or guardians still in the village. While they recognize relatives there - that is, admit to them, they do not visit them. One (called Josefina) did visit an aunt for permission to marry, but says that now that she is married, she has no time to go back.

An even more interecting pattern in terms of the "village"-"city", "rural"-"urban" question emerges in the consideration of visiting patterns of members of the family of orientation originally from the village but now in the city. Among those domestic servants who live in, seven regularly visit members of their family of orientation now in the city. Of the other two, one (Consuelo) visits two aunts originally from the village, the other lives sufficiently close to the city to go back to her family of orientation in the village on her day off. On the other hand, of those who live out, none regularly visit members of the family of orientation, though all of them have such family members in the city. They say they have too much else to do to spend time visiting members of the family who are "too far away."

Concerning the family of procreation, of the nine who live in, eight are not married. These are all women. Only the mayordomo, Jose, both lives in and has a family. Of those who live out, two are married, and two have or have had liasons with men. Such liasons have resulted in four children for one woman (Antonia), and three children for the other (Tomasina).

Of the two who are married, one (Lydia), an older woman, has been married for approximately forty years, and has two grown children. The other (Josefina) is recently married and has no children at this time.

With relation to the wider kinship network in general, one notes much of the same pattern as discovered previously. Seven of the nine domestic servants who live in maintain contact with their relatives in the village of origin, visiting them whenever a vacation and funds allow a trip back. Of the two who do not maintain such kin relationships, one is Loti, whose mother apparently left her town completely. The other is Mari, whose parents and all but one member of her family of orientation, now live in Guatemala City. It does seem that those with members of the family of orientation in the village are perhaps most likely to visit other kin there. Of those who live out, two (Josefina and Tomasina) were raised by relatives and have broken virtually all ties with them (they were mean and harsh taskmasters, making the orphaned children virtual slaves), while two (Lydia and Antonia) admit to many relatives in their villages of origin, but do not return to visit them. None of these have members of the family of orientation in the village, and all, one might again add, have primary group relationships with their own families of procreation in the city.

A look at leisure time activity (if it can be called such - it is, basically, simply time off from domestic work in the house of employ) also provides some data on the present question of differences in the social relationships of the two categories. Domestic servants receive one to two days off per week, and usually a yearly vacation. What do they do with this time?

To consider the live-in servants first, all but the mayordomo see, on their day off, members of the family of orientation located in the city (or nearby, in the case of Maria), or lacking such close relations, to (as is the case with Marta and Consuelo) see those relatives who are in the city or nearby. These latter seemed most often to be maternal aunts who had had a hand in bringing the woman to the city. Only one goes to the abode of a lone male (her nephew), and she does not visit him so much as her room, where he stays. He is gone during the day when she, Juana, is there, and she does not stay overnight. In fact, none of the women except Maria stay overnight outside the house of employ. Maria spends the night at home. The mayordomo sees his family of procreation on his day off.

Those who live out see not members of the family of orientation, but of procreation in their time off. If members of this family work at this time, they see their place of abode.

As for activities on the day off; live-in servants may simply go to the place of residence of their family or relatives, or they may go shopping, to the movies, visiting friends, or occasionally, to church. All of those who live-out said they go home to clean, do their wash, and straighten their own residences. One, Lydia, who has been in the city longer than any other servant studied, said she sometimes takes a bus out of the city to surrounding tourist spots - Antigua, Lake Amatitlan, Chichicastenango, and the like.

Thus an interesting pattern may be seen in this limited number of cases - those who live in go to visit members of the family with whom they have the village of origin, as well as kinship, in common. Yet they may go out into the city itself, going to movies, shopping, looking about,

touring, visiting, interacting thereby more fully with the city, its institutions and its status roles, than does the live-out servant who merely goes home. There is another factor to be considered here, however, that has to do with the degree of responsibility associated with each activity. It seems that those who go to take care of a place of residence, dealing thereby with the problems of neighbors, the purchasing of household necessities, the paying of bills, etc., are engaged in an activity of more weight, in social relationships of greater personal consequence, than is the case with those who interact with the city as a temporary, and relatively uncritical in terms of one's basic life needs, source of entertainment, consumer goods, or friends, and the means to come by them, that is, stores, buses and the like. While a live-in servant may be aware of what her relatives do as they live in the city, it seems that a degree of naivite may still hold here among those who do not actually do the business of living in the city as a city dweller.

Further, one may consider the day off pattern itself of live-in and live-out workers. Those who live in, as stated, have one or two set days off every week. The live-out worker, on the other hand, has a more flexible schedule, especially when one talks, as we are here, of washer women who work only part of the week at any one house. Such washer women often can set their own work patterns, taking on more or fewer washing jobs as they see fit. Thus they may have more days off than the live-in servant. Further, they have a set job to perform; when they complete it, they can go. They are not on constant call as are those servants who live in. We find then, that the live-out servant has more opportunity for interaction in the city proper, outside the house of employ, and that data

on the non-visiting of village family and relatives, the maintenance of families of procreation in the city, and of residences outside the house of employ, bear this out.

With reference to vacations, one might ask whether one can distinguish between live-in and live-out servants, and the frequency of trips to the village of origin on vacations.

Among those who live in, seven of the nine interviewed attempt to go back to the village of origin at least once a year. Most often they schedule vacations around or ask for extra days off for Christmas, New Year's, and the day of the village's patron saint. Jose, the mayordomo, attempts to go back to his village of origin at least every six months, particularly on November 1, the day of grave decoration. One woman, Marta, quit her last job because her employer would give her neither Christmas nor New Year's off - her mother came from her village to celebrate the occasions in Marta's room. Of those who live in and do not go back on vacations, Loti, now from Guatemala City, and Mari, whose family of orientation she helped to bring to the city, do not go back.

None of those who live out go back to their villages of origin on vacations or for special days. They say they haven't the time or the money. Lydia finds that returning to the village depresses her - she doesn't know if it is the village itself, or her that is at fault, but she does not feel happy upon going there. Josefina says she never cared for the fiestas and merrymaking of the holidays when she lived there, and still does not. She sees then, no reason to go back for them. And as she does not feel a strong obligational or emotional tie to the termagant aunt who raised her, she finds no reason to go back. It is interesting however, that she

did go to the aunt for permission to marry, after having twice run away from her in earlier years. Tomasina seems to have no interest in returning to her village of origin. Antonia lives only a short distance from her village of origin, but nevertheless does not make it a practice to attend the town fiestas.

As regards place of residence, which we can take to be indicative of a certain amount of interaction (or lack of it) with the city proper - those who own, rent, or live in rooms, apartments, or houses in the city must deal with landlords, neighbors, furniture shops, electric and water bills, gas bills, grocery and clothing stores - of those who live in, six have no other place of residence but the house where they are employed. Of the three who have other residences, one woman (Loti) goes to her mother's house in the city where her brothers and sisters live, and where she grew up. It will be recalled that Loti has been in Guatemala City since she was very young. Her brothers and sisters were born in the city and consider themselves as <u>of</u> the city. Another, (Juana) keeps a room in the city in which she stores her things. A nephew recently arrived from her village of origin lives in the room - she goes there to rest on her day off, to be alone, but returns to the house of employ before dark. The last is the <u>mayordomo</u> - he has a wife and three children living in a newly purchased home.

Those who live out all have places of residence in the city. One (Antonia), lives in a room with her four adult offspring, but does not pay rent, another (Lydia), lives with her husband in a small apartment. Josefina lives in a small apartment with her husband, while Tomasina lives in a one-room apartment with her three adult offspring.

Thus we might make a few generalizations at this point, based on the above information. There is a high correlation between visiting of the family of orientation, lack of a family of procreation, vacationing in the village and living in, on the one hand, and between non-visiting of the family of orientation, possession of a family of procreation, not vacationing in the village, and residence outside the house of employ, on the other.

Another manifestation of the loci of social relationships emerges in the expenditure of wages. Those who live in, except for Jose, the mayordomo, send all or the majority of their wages to the family of orientation in the village, or in the city. They do not send wages to more distant consanguinal kin. An example is Beatriz, who helps her sister, married with four children in Guatemala City, with a portion of her wages. She helps her father still in the village of origin with some cash, though not much, as she says her sister actually raised and supported her through school. While she has other relatives in her village of origin, she does not send cash to them. On the other hand, those who live out use their wages to pay rent, transportation, electricity, lights - they do not send a portion to the village of origin. They speak rather, of the difficulty of making ends meet for themselves alone.

In more formal social relationships with institutions, such as education, the market, and the church, differences between those who live out and those who live in arise. Those who do establish a family of procreation in the city come in contact quite often with the educational system as their children attend school. This is true of three live-in servants as well - Loti, who, growing up in the city went to school there, and the mayordomo,

whose children attend school. Mari, whose family of orientation is now in the city also has been exposed to the school system through her brother, though she herself has not attended. In general, however, while those who do have families of procreation in the city do tend to come into contact with the city school system, those who do not have such families do not come into contact with the school system. Interestingly, those who expressed desires to go on to school in the city have members of families of orientation or procreation in the city. Of those who live in, six have no contact with the city educational system, child or adult. Of those who live out, three of the four have children who went to or are in school and are thus acquainted with the school system.

All deal with the market; buying, and at times selling. As mentioned, however, the live-out servant has more extensive contact with such activity, buying necessities, food, renting a place to live, while the servant who lives in buys less with his own money, finds a number of necessities included in his job, and has a place of residence established when he takes a job. Thus in the realm of the social relationships of buying and selling, the live-out servant is ahead of the live-in servant.

With regard to church attendance, none seem to go to church regularly in the city. Those who live in, however, seem most active in their village churches. Jose, the mayordomo, and Beatriz, both live-in servants, demonstrate what may be a transitional process upon arrival in the city. Jose participated in religious fiestas much of his youth. Upon arrival in the city, however, he worked for a number of high diplomatic officials, and had the opportunity to see church officials, including the Papal Nuncio,

drinking or having affairs with women. He thus feels little interest in going to church, he says, and at any rate has no time to do so. Beatriz also spoke of the lecherous ways of priests and of the harm young women can come to at the harm of priests. The older women, both live-in and live-out did speak of attending mass, but it was live-in servants with social relationships of other natures in the village of origin, or with members of the village now in the city, who most often spoke of participation in religious sodalities and church organizations, and in the village of origin.

All servants, live-in and live-out, remain uninvolved in politics. They do not join political parties, they do not campaign. They speak of the politics of Guatemala disparagingly, of how the rich, landed interests terrorize and control the poor and their votes. They speak of the danger of belonging to a political group, and of the pressure put on the peasantry to support regional political bosses. They often then fail to see the political arena as a meaningful arena of social relationships. They do not join political interest groups, agitate for reform, or belong to unions. A factor to be mentioned here however, is of course the fact that those interviewed (with the exception of Jose) were women.

As there is little or no differentiation here between live in and live out servants, we must look farther for the answer to this similarity. It seems that the answer lies in the historical position of the landless, peasant population of Guatemala, controlled by landed interests far above him, no matter what his life may be or where it might be, or who he might deal with. Most social relationships are thus apolitical, except in terms of dealings with ultimate sources of power, regional busses, city busses,

party members in search of votes, in which those in power deal with a largely apathetic and apolitical mass. Or so the situation seems. What lies beneath the apolitical surface is something many in Guatemala want to find out. But such a problem is not of concern here.

Results

With this information we may now answer the fourth question posed, by saying that the social relationships of those servants who live in differ in a number of ways from the social relationships of those servants who live out.

Those domestic workers who live in maintain ties with their villages of origin, as seen by their relationships with families of orientation and other kin in or from the village of origin, the return to villages for holidays, and the sending home of wages. They demonstrate non-establishment of extensive social relationships in the city in terms of their non-maintenance of families of procreation (with the exception of the mayordomo, Jose) their visiting of family and kin from the village of origin and not of strangers from other areas, their non-maintenance of a dwelling place in the city and the consequential non-participation in crucial, formal social relationships involving the place of residence, or in the more informal social relationships of neighborhood living, and their non-expenditure of wages in the city. They also less frequently come into contact with the educational system, the market, and the church. Domestic live-in servants do maintain social relationships in the city, yet they maintain such relationships with the family of orientation and the consanguinal kin also from the village of origin. All then maintain ties, in the form mentioned, with the village itself. It thus is the difference not so much of having social relationships or not, but of having social relationships with members of the village of origin that

is of concern considered here and in the second part of the question.

To return to those domestic workers who live out. They have established social relationships in new families of procreation in the city, in the renting, purchasing, or using of a room in some part of the city away from the house of employ, in the dealing with those who make life in the city possible - store-owners, landlords, electricians, neighbors, public schools, the market. They fail to maintain ties in the form of social relations in that they do not visit members of the family of orientation or consanguinal kin either in the village of origin or in the city; they do not return to their villages of origin for visits and holidays, and they do not send wages home.

To sum up then, we find that the live in and live out servants lead lives involving different social relationships. Those who live in seem more closely tied to village life and more separate from city life, while those who live out have established new ties within the city that correlate with the breaking of ties with the village. It is difficult to say which comes first; it is probably a combination of the breaking of village social relationships and the establishment of city-based social relationships that actually occurs in the case of the live out domestic worker.

With the data supplied by questions one through three, and by question four, we can now answer question five - can correlations be drawn between the two categories of domestic servant, "rural" and "urban" factors, and the loci of social relationships?

The answer seems to be yes, the correlations being between live-in servants, "rural" factors, and the locus of social relationships in the village of origin, or with members of the village of origin, and between

live-out servants, "urban" factors, and the locus of social relationships in the city.

Live-in servants both exhibit "rural" tendencies, and maintain extensive social relationships with kin from or in the village of origin. Their social relationships within the city are correspondingly low.

Live-out servants, on the other hand, appear to be more "urban" and maintain extensive social relationships with the family of procreation founded in the city. Their social relationships with the village of origin are correspondingly low.

It will be noted that the distinction made here is a very fine one. It may seem that the argument here is somewhat circular, that "rural" behavior is with village people, and "urban" behavior is with city people. Yet though this may seem circular, it is not. Much of the same data was used in describing "rural" and "urban" factors and social relationships, for the simple reason that the terms "rural" and "urban" concern social relationships. What is important in social relationships is the locus of these relationships; where do affective ties lie? Where are one's recognized kin? What interaction does one have with the city? It does seem that those with different loci of social relationships are different with regard to "rural" and "urban" factors as well, and that the two are necessarily concomitant. "Rural" behavior depends on other "rural" people, on people from the village, "urban" behavior depends upon contact with the city.

Thus what does this tell us of the original problem posed, that of the question of the clarity of the "rural" and "urban" typologies? Do the distinctions "rural" and "urban" have any validity, or are they of little value? It seems that the terms do have value, and that they can

be helpful explanatory devices in the study of migration. They allow one to apply some sense to the process of coming to live in a city, and they provide a way to distinguish different life styles that seems to correlate with the actual situation.

However, the terms must be more carefully defined in the light of empirical research. This is, after all, the end of empirical research - to clarify theory in order that it may more ably explain reality. Research done here indicates that the locus of social relationships - in the village of origin, or the city - is a prime factor in the existence of "rural" and "urban" factors. Thus it seems that the terms "rural" and "urban" must also include reference to extensive social relationships in a village, or in a city. The causal flow here is uncertain, though most likely a circular flow occurs, that is, in the case of the live-in servant, social relationships with the village of origin or with members of such a village promote "rural-ness" and limit the emergence of "urban" factors by limiting social relationships with the city, while at the same time, "ruralness" and lack of contact with the city reinforce social relationships with the village of origin. As regards the live-out servant, limited social relationships with members of the village of origin limit "rural-ness" and promote the emergence of "urban" factors by resulting in extensive social relationships with the city, while at the same time, "urban-ness" and extensive social relationships within the city limit social relationships with the village of origin and therefore "rural-ness."

With regard to value orientations, another factor of importance to the "rural"-"urban" typologies comes to view. It was noted that all but the longest city dwellers saw the village as a place of honesty and little

violence of a criminal sort. This seems to be indicative of two things - first, that there is a continuum from "rural" to "urban", along which individuals and groups may be variously located - and that in fact there are possibly two continua - one dealing with social factors, and one with values, with cultural factors, along which migrants move at unequal rates. The number of social relationships then, seems to be only one factor in the changing of values - length of time in the urban center is another. Thus the "rural"-"urban" typologies must also take a time factor into account, if they are to be applied to migration patterns.

In sum then, we might say that the village to city migrant does exhibit differential degrees of "rural" and "urban" factors, and that these may be correlated with the loci and extent of social relationships, and possibly with length of time in the city. The "rural" and "urban" typologies are valid, to the extent that they include these things. The source of much controversy in the past has been it seems, the lack of clarity and specificity in such terms. Perhaps this research will suggest other possible ways of making more useful the "rural"-"urban" typologies.

The findings concerning politics indicate something of the nature of the Guatemalan political and power system in general - that the domestic servants and the peasantry they come from have little association or social involvement with the political system. Its machinations go on above them and affect them indirectly. It seems that the distinctions of "urban" and "rural" do not really enter into such a consideration, at least not as the terms are used in this paper.

Concluding Remarks

It is hoped that the preceding data have provided some basis for the consideration of the question posed concerning the concepts "rural" and "urban." There are, of course, drawbacks to this study, the main problem being its limited scope. A wider study, using a greater sample, techniques of participatory observation, visits to all villages of origin, all kin, and all family members, would provide greater evidence for consideration.

The study, moreover, did not emphasize the other side of the migration coin, that is, the influence of "urban" factors on village life -- the migration of city ideas, objects, and people to the village, and the extent to which this colors the migrant's processes of adaptation to city life. One can only say that, regardless of the "urban," city influences in a village, the objective factors of size, density, and heterogeneity are nevertheless sufficiently different to necessitate a change in life style and certain social relationships when one moves from the village to the city. It is this that must be considered in a study such as the one presented here.

One other aspect of the study that might add to the information already gained involves the element of time. While an effort was made to interview people with differing lengths of time in the city, the individuals interviewed could not themselves be observed over time. Information on the actual process of migration as it occurs over time would be valuable in determining the actual movement from village to city relationships, and from "rural" to "urban" patterns. Such information would also possibly explain those value judgements that seem to be based largely on length of time lived in the city.

Yet two points may be made in defence of the present study. First, the data presented exhibit such clearcut patterns in most areas as to indicate a certain degree of validity. Secondly, the study, as an exploratory one, does not attempt to supply any final answer the question posed in the beginning. It merely attempts to use some empirical evidence to indicate possible answers or suggestions for the clarification of some theoretical points. More extensive research can follow, testing the lines of thought here delineated.

Some Final Thoughts on the Rural and Urban Typologies

What in the end can be said about the "rural" and "urban" typologies? What value do the terms have? Are they useful in empirical research? Perhaps the best way to deal with these questions is to consider another, that is, the question of the applicability of the terms "rural" and "urban" to the behavior of individuals or groups of individuals. Such a question leads us into a discussion of what was done here, what Redfield and Wirth meant, and what the terms "rural" and "urban" actually involve. Thus to return to the question of applicability:

Is not Redfield referring to a type of community when he speaks of "rural" factors? The addressing of this question provides us with several last comments on the problem with which this paper began; the meaning of "rural", and the meaning of "urban."

First, while Redfield does seem to deal with the idea of community, a community is nevertheless made up of the behavior of individuals. An individual acts and interacts with the members of a community, who form such an aggregate through persistent interaction. As successful interaction requires the existence of status/roles, it becomes evident that rights and obligations with those with whom one interacts become a basic aspect of an individual's behavior. Thus in his interactions, the individual will reflect those status/roles, rights, and obligations he maintains in the group, and thereby reflect the nature of the group, or community itself. Thus we may look at the individual, just as we may look at the community.

Second, the use of the terms "rural" and "urban" as referring to aspects of behavior seemed to prove fruitful in the analysis of migration. Such terms provided a basic classificatory scheme that, when accompanied by variables of social relationships, proved explanatory of certain aspects of migrants' behavior from the myriad actions and interactions of the domestic servant, certain interactions could be factored out and made more comprehensible in the light of the "rural" and "urban" typologies. Thus, if the use of such terms was a bit out of the ordinary, the results such use provided seem nevertheless worthwhile and valuable.

Third, the correlation established between social relationships and "rural" and "urban" factors as used provide valuable insight into the "rural" and "urban" concepts themselves. Redfield and Wirth did feel that "rural" factors were characteristic of villages, and "urban" factors characteristic of cities. Lewis and Tax found this not to be the case. But what an analysis of the loci of social relationships shows is that Redfield and Wirth are in one sense correct, that "rural" behavior is tied to social relationships, ties, with a "rural" village, and that "urban" behavior is tied to social relationships, ties, with an "urban" city. Thus we find that the spatial dimension in the consideration of "rural" and "urban" factors is not so important as the social dimension: no matter how distant one may be from the actual village, social relationships may still bring one close to it. This is not to say that the social and geographic entity of the village is not important, for it is. Regardless of social relationships, there must be somewhere an actual village, to which individuals return, or at least refer.

Thus this study seems to have laid the groundwork for the clarification of one point of the "rural" and "urban" concepts, and provided as well insight into possible uses of the "rural"-"urban" scheme in studies of migration or other processes involving villages and cities. It provides as well, it is hoped, food for thought and the nourishing of other empirical research on the concepts of "rural" and "urban."

Appendices

It was felt that the inclusion of factual data on Guatemala in the body of the paper was out of place, that such an inclusion would harm the symmetry and order of the argument presented.

Thus the following pages present some information important to any study of migration, and helpful to the reader who knows little about Guatemala. The migration of the village dweller can only be fully understood in the light of conditions in the village -- its history, its exposure to city influences, its economic situation -- and of conditions in the city. Hence below appear some general comments on village and city life which, it is hoped, will provide the reader with at least a vague knowledge of the actual situation. More than the material for a "vague knowledge" of the situation cannot be presented here. Work in this area, in the empirical analysis of village and city life in depth, must of course be done at some point to fully round out the data provided in the body of this work. Such discussion will consider first the village, and then Guatemala City. Discussion of villages will concentrate largely on Indian villages, for all but one of those interviewed came from the Western Highlands, and other predominantly Indian areas. As we are ultimately concerned with migration, and as those studied are, on the basis of income, lower class, discussion of Guatemala City will revolve around the consideration of lower class migrants in Guatemala City.

Village and Countryside History

The village dwellers of Guatemala are descended from Maya and other indigenous tribes discovered and subjugated by the Spaniards between 1521 and 1532. Previous to the conquest, the highlands were populated by a number of warring nations. Such nations were organized for the pursuit of war. Centrally-located fortress and ceremonial cities were surrounded by peasant hamlets, which provided manpower and agricultural products in return for protection. There was as well, a flow of cultural information between the centers and the surrounding hamlets, of which the latter were the recipients of the "great tradition" of the ceremonial centers.

Upon the arrival of the Spaniards and the creation of the Captaincy General in Guatemala, the situation changed. The indigenous population, at least ideally, was moved to new towns constructed on the Spanish model, with Spanish priests and governmental officials in residence. The success of this "new towns" policy was variable; in some areas Indians did settle in, in others, they drifted back to the hamlets from which they had come. Such success or failure often was due to the growing influence of a powerful new group in the later years of the colonial administration -- that population born of Indian and Spanish miscegenation. This mestizo population, called Ladino (though precisely why remains unclear), was culturally more Spanish and European than Indian, probably due to the fact that the fathers, in two societies patriarchically and patrilineally-oriented, were Spanish. Yet by Spanish law, these Ladinos could not hold the highest government posts, were not considered "Spanish" in the full sense of the word, and thus developed loyalties to their own group, and to what would eventually become the Republic of Guatemala. These Ladinos, as

landowners, merchants, and lower-level political and governmental office-holders, began to move into the Indian towns, and to take economic and political control in those towns where they acquired sufficient strength to do so. This often forced Indians out of the towns, or forced them to assume subservient positions in the towns. Thus even in present-day Guatemala, there runs a continuum from Ladino to Indian towns. Towns with large Ladino populations generally have small Indian populations; the majority of the Indian population of that area (if there is such a population) will be in Indian villages and hamlets. Towns with relatively small Ladino populations are still likely to be controlled by Ladinos, who hold the local government offices and own the larger shops carrying goods from the cities. In such cases, the Ladinos take up residence in the center of town, while the Indians take up residence on the outskirts, or again, scatter to smaller hamlets where they are physically and in many ways culturally remote from the main village, though dependent on it for market, religious, and governmental reasons.

Indians in the earlier days of the colonial period at times found themselves victims of the encomienda system, a system of land distribution practiced by the Spanish crown in which land, as well as the people on it, were given to Spaniards who had performed a service for the crown. While the system was formally abolished during the colonial period, the practice tended to continue, and a system of large plantations developed in Guatemala.

Following Independence in 1821, Guatemala became a republic in 1823. This did not, however, significantly change the situation in the rural areas. The by now quite large mestizo group, the Ladinos, took the remains of Spanish control into their own hands, and continued to develop a national and regional political structure which exerted varying degeees of influence on the countryside. A series of dictatorial laws promulgated by the four

dictators who ruled Guatemala through the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, affected to differing degrees different portions of the Indian population. These laws demanded a certain amount of what became forced, extremely poorly paid labor. Thus much of the Indian population was expolited as a source of cheap labor by those owning the large plantations. Further, with the majority of land in large landholdings, of a landed elite, land available to peasant farmers was scarce and often poor. Thus, those accessible to governmental control and observation, as well as those who wished to augment their incomes, often found themselves working on the coffee and banana planations that became the source of income of nineteenth and twentieth-century Guatemala.

The village situation, the labor situation, and the cultural separation of Indians and Ladinos led to the perpetuation among Indians of a village, classically rural life style quite isolated in many cases from the Ladinos. In areas where Indians lived away from the presence of Ladinos in nearby villages, or where they were simply geographically distant from and physically inaccessible to Ladino exploitation or strict governmental control, Indian life remained insulated from that of the Ladino. The main political and religious institution of the Indian community, the Civil-Religious Hierarchy, performed necessary internal political and religious functions for the Indian community, and served as a buffer or liason -- depending on the situation -- between the Indian community and the Ladino national and regional governmental structures, as well as the Catholic church. The Civil-Religious Hierarchy thus served as a cultural insulator for the scattered Indian communities. The hierarchy also often functioned in those towns with Ladinos and Indians, adjudicating Indian disputes, articulating Indian wishes to Ladino authorities, and interpreting Ladino

wishes to the Indian population.

This situation received tremendous impetus for change, however, in the so-called Revolutionary period of 1944-1954. It was the revolutionary governments' aim to reduce the power of the landed aristocracy by creating a peasantry allied with the national government against the landowners. To this end, the government sponsored a number of activities in the countryside: government representatives encouraged the development of farming cooperatives, of labor unions on coffee plantations, and of local branches of political parties. Electoral processes, out of existence during the regime of the last dictator, Jorge Ubico, were reinstated, and efforts were made to encourage the Indian vote. While the reforms thus initiated were largely halted by the 1954 overthrow of the revolutionary regime and the reinstatement of the landed interests, they did set in motion in a number of Indian communities a process of change that continued beyond the revolutionary period. Indian communities were above all exposed to the possibilities of participation in the national social structure. Indians voted, and a number of young Indians in Indian communities ran for local governmental offices in the Ladino system, undermining the functioning of the Civil-Religious Hierarchy.

While political controls tightened after 1954, the general process of increasing exposure to national, Ladino life continued. While Indians fell back into the shadows of political organizations for a number of years, rural development programs sponsored by the national government began in the 1960's to encourage farmer's cooperatives, crop diversification, and more modern planting techniques. North American, European, and Guatemalan agents of change appeared in the villages. Roads were built during and after the revolutionary period, and are still opening areas of the country

to contact with the larger cities and with other rural areas. Radios, newspapers, educational programs, permanent stores carrying factory-produced goods, all came into the countryside at increasing rates following the revolutionary period (Ebel, 1964).

Thus the position of the Indian in the countryside at present is the result of a mixture of a number of factors: historical Ladino-Indian separatism, Ladino exploitation of Indian labor and control of much of the arable land, and, on the other hand, a slowly-growing concern for the Indian's well-being and position as a Guatemalan. It must nevertheless be remembered, however, that at present, the Indian has no source of power. Indians are a fragmented group, they have little land, and little prestige. They are exploited by political vote-getters and thus do not often participate in the political system as active contributors. While this is changing, a significant change will most probably not occur until the Indian population has built up a significant power base for bargaining purposes(Adams, 1970).

Economic Conditions in the Countryside

According to the Inter-American Development Bank (Eighth Annual Report, Social Progress Trust Fund, 1968), of all farms in Guatemala, 88% are less than seven hectares in size (the average size is less than two hectares), and occupy only 14% of the arable land area. On the other hand, 2% of all farms in Guatemala are over forty-five hectares in size, and occupy 72% of the available farmland. Thus the majority of the farming population farms the minority of the available land area. Such a landholding situation gives rise to and perpetuates a basic, three-fold economic division of the rural population. At the risk of over-simplification, there are: (1) those who cultivate small, independently or communally-owned landholdings (usually concentrated in the central and western highlands), (2) those who work as wage laborers on the plantations, and (3), those salesmen, small store owners, government representatives, and plantation administrators, who provide the towns, villages, and plantation settlements of the rural areas with a glimpse of the "great tradition" of the modernizing world beyond their borders. Those who own the large plantations might be expected to also count as part of the country population, but as the majority of these live in the cities, they cannot be considered as such.

Those on small landholdings tend to live in small, closely-knit and culturally-distinct communities, linked to one-another through a system of regional markets for the exhcange of locally-produced farm goods, and to the national culture by government agents, store owners, school teachers, and the like. These points of contact with the world outside the local community have become a source of potential and actual change for village

life, forcing upon or simply presenting to the rural community alternatives to certain aspects of its life style. Each nuclear family of a community cultivates its own plot of land, to which it has direct rights of ownership or usufruct. On such land, families grow corn, beans, wheat, potatoes, fruits, and other vegetables, depending on elevation, soil, and climate. Such small-scale farming, however, is generally insufficient to supply a family's full needs; what is acquired thereby must be augmented in some way. The farmer or his family may sell a certain portion of the farm's produce in order to purchase matches, clandles, farming implements, or other foodstuffs. Or they may produce various items by home labor to sell for an income oabove that produced from the land. Some may become small entrepeneurs, owning small household stores, butcher shops, or furniture-making establishments, though usually all within the immediate kinship group. Lastly, family members may work in positions made possible by the economic demands of the society outside the network of rural communities themselves, as migrant labor on coffee and other plantations during harvest seasons, on road construction teams, in new industries developed in rural areas, or in urban areas as domestic servants, unskilled labor, or journeymen practicing a trade learned in the village. Those who move out of the community for a time may still spend a set part of the year in their village of origin. Such movement in and out of the local community does two basic and opposing things,(1), it provides the community with added income, allowing it to remain economically and thus often culturally solvent by providing cash with which to carry out necessary physical and traditional functions, while it at the same time provides the community with (2) the items and ideas of a non-traditional, non-small-farm-oriented way of life. Participation in the occupational structure existing beyond the

small farms brings the peasant closer to a life style not his own, and introduces him to cultural accoutrements as well as modes of social organization already not a part of his experience.

The plantation wage worker forms the majority of the remainder of the population of the countryside classified as "poor." This country dweller is a full-time worker on a coffee or other plantation, and therefore usually lives on the plantation itself. The large plantations are usually owned by absentee landowners, and are controlled by a plantation administrator. It is the administrator who pays the workers, makes advances on their salaries, and encourages or discourages traditional community behavior among his resident workers by providing loans for various group ceremonial activities. The administrator, then, acts as a kind of cultural broker by providing wages, demanding harvest quotas, and exposing workers to a system of earning alien to that of the independent small farm. On the other hand, many factors work to insulate the worker from the life outside the plantation. He is usually geographically and physically isolated here from other parts of the nation. Families of workers become established on plantations and form actual communities which remain quite separate from the mainstream of Guatemalan life. Yet here too the situation is changing, as, as from the villages, young workers leave the plantation in search of economic opportunity, and return with stories of different life styles. Labor organizations and political parties, as mentioned, have also made themselves known on the Guatemalan plantations.

The last of the three mentioned divisions is comprised of those by now frequently-mentioned representatives of the world outside the

villages who through the fulfillment of governmental functions, the sale of necessities such as matches and steel farming equipment, or of luxuries such as soft drinks, or the fulfillment of religious functions for a population at least nominally Catholic, deal with the village population as presenters of the world outside. Such individuals generally form the village elite, and are centered not in the smallest rural hamlets, but in the larger, more influential towns. They are most often Ladinos.

Such is the economic situation of the domestic servant coming from the countryside described. Emphasis has been placed here on both the impetus for moving out, and the sources of knowledge about where to go and what to expect. While there is a great deal more that could be said about Guatemalan village life, it is hoped that the preceding provides at least a basic understanding of some of the factors with which the migrant, while in the village, deals.

Guatemala City

Guatemala City has from the colonial period been the hub of activity in Guatemala. It has been and is the country's main governmental, political, economic, educational, and religious center. The central government is located in Guatemala City, as are the country's industry, its capital, its best schools, its universities, and the Papal Nuncio of the Vatican. It is, furthermore, the center of the newest international trends in consumer goods, and the main center of distribution of such items. Import and export offices are located here, as are foreign corporation offices, banks, and the diplomatic missions of other nations. Guatemala's television stations broadcast from Guatemala City, and Guatemalan roads, air routes, and most railways center in Guatemala City. Thus from the capitol of the Spanish colony and an early administrative and religious center, Guatemala City has become the heart of the economic, political, and religious institutions of Guatemala. It is no wonder then, that much of the village population of Guatemala comes to the city in search of work, and it is no wonder that they find work, in the homes of the economic, political, and religious elite.

There is much movement in Guatemala between countryside and city. Many village dwellers, as discussed, take seasonal work on the coast, many come to Guatemala City on business or to sell their own produce. They may visit relatives and friends, or come on errands for the plantations for which they work. This constant movement, combined with a great deal of infomation about cities available in the villages, allows for an easier transition from village to city life.

Yet Guatemala City is still different from the villages. A few

comments about city life in general can be made from work done by Bryan Roberts and Richard Adams, which provide the reader with some basis of comparison with village life.

When a migrant from a village arrives in the city, it does not seem to be the case that he joins a physically distinct "urban" village. Scarcity of housing and extreme residential and occupational mobility result in a constant flow of urban dwellers from one area to another. Place of residence and place of work, as well as residence groups and work groups, often do not coincide, except, of course, in the case of the live-in domestic worker. There is much shifting of housing and jobs in a search for better housing and more remunerative work.

Low-income, scattered residence groups, and long hours combine to make the formation of interest groups rare. Such organizations may also be limited by the persistence of ties with the countryside.

There are few formal requirements for low-income city dwellers; education is required but not rigidly enforced, jobs most often taken do not demand long periods of training, and participation in political parties is low.

Guatemala City is the industrial center of the nation; over half of the nation's industry is centered in and about Guatemala City(Encyclopedia Britannica). Yet the bulk of this industry is light industry -- food products, soft drinks, shoes, and distilled liquor factories are common -- and the demand for labor therefore low. The result of such a situation, when combined with poor economic conditions in the countryside, is the in-migration of a number of laborers for whom there are no industrial jobs. These laborers thus often enter personal service occupations, working as domestic servants, waiters, or small-scale salesmen. Thus one sees the economic situation into which the migrants come, and why they may go into domestic work.

As is true of the countryside, a great deal more could be said in reference to Guatemala City. Still, the most salient features have been pointed up, and there is little room for further expansion here. In closing it might be said, however, that Guatemala City, with a population of , is by far the largest city in Guatemala. The next-largest city, Quezaltenango, has a population of only approximately 45,000. All of these factors, making Guatemala City number one in the country, have meant that migration to Guatemala City has been at a tremendous rate, and will continue to be in the future.

Selected Bibliography

1. Abu-Lughod, Janet. "Migrant Adjustment to City Life: The Egyptian Case." In The City in Developing Countries: Readings in Urbanism and Urbanization, edited by Gerald Breese. Princeton, 1964.

2. Adams, Richard N. Crucifixion by Power: Essays on Guatemalan National Social Structure. Austin, 1970.

3. Adams, Richard N. "Nationalization." In The Handbook of Middle American Indians, Vol. 6, edited by Manning Nash, Vol. editor, Robert Wauchope, General Editor. Austin, 1967.

4. Adams, Richard N. Political Changes in Guatemalan Indian Communities. Middle American Research Institute. Austin, 1957.

5. Adams, Richard N., Lewis, Oscar, et al. Social Change in Latin America Today; Its Implications for United States Policy. New York, 1960.

6. Arriola, Jorge, ed. Cultura indigena de Guatemala: ensayos de antropologia Social. Seminario de Integracion Social Guatemalteca. Guatemala, 1959.

7. Arriola, Jorge. Integracion social en Guatemala. Guatemala, 1956.

8. Beals, Ralph L. "Acculturation." In The Handbook of Middle American Indians, Vol. 6, edited by Manning Nash, Volume editor, and Robert Wauchope, General Editor. Austin, 1967.

9. Breese, Gerald, ed. The City in Newly Developing Countries: Readings on Urbanism and Urbanization. Englewood Cliffs, 1969.

10. Cancian, Hank. "Civil and Religious Organizations." In The Handbook of Middle American Indians, Vol. 6, edited by Manning Nash, Volume editor, and Robert Wauchope, General Editor. Austin, 1967.

11. Caplow, Theodore. "The Social Ecology of Guatemala City." In Studies in Human Ecology, edited by George A. Theodorson. New York, 1961.

12. Davis, Kingsley and Casis, Ana. "Urbanization in Latin America." In Cities and Society: A Revised Reader in Urban Sociology, edited by Paul K. Hatt and Albert J. Reiss, Jr. Glencoe, 1957.

13. Ebel, Roland. "Political Change in Guatemalan Indian Communities." Journal of Inter-American Studies, Vol. 6: (1964), pp. 91-104.

14. Etzioni, Amatai, and Etzioni, Eva, ed. Social Change: Sources, Patterns, and Consequences. New York, 1964.

15. Fava, Sylvia Fleis, ed. Urbanism in World Perspective; A Reader. New York, 1968.

16. Germani, Gino. "Migration and Acculturation." In Handbook for Social Research in Urban Areas, edited by Philip M. Hauser. Paris, France, 1964.

17. Hatt, Paul K., and Reiss, Albert J., Jr. Cities and Society: A Revised Reader in Urban Sociology. Glencoe, 1957.

18. Hauser, Philip M., ed. Handbook for Social Research in Urban Areas. Paris, France, 1957.

19. Hauser, Philip M. and Schnore, Leo F., eds. The Study of Urbanization. New York, 1965.

20. Heath, Dwight B. and Adams, Richard N. Contemporary Cultures and Societies of Latin America. Scranton, 1965.

21. Hunt Eva and Nash, June. "Local and Territorial Units." In The Handbook of Middle American Indians, Vol. 6, edited by Manning Nash, Volume editor and Robert Wauchope, General Editor. Austin, 1967.

22. King, Arden R. "Urbanization and Industrialization." In The Handbook of Middle American Indians, Vol. 6, edited by Manning Nash, Volume editor and Robert Wauchope, General Editor. Austin, 1967.

23. Kuper, Hilda, ed. Urbanization and Migration in West Africa. Los Angeles, 1965.

24. Larson, Olaf. "Rural Society." In the International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, edited by David Sills. Vol. 13, pp. 580-587.

25. Lewis, Oscar. Five Families: Mexican Case Studies in the Culture of Poverty. New York, 1959.

26. Lewis, Oscar. "Further Observations on the Folk-Urban Continuum and Urbanization with special reference to Mexico City." In The Study of Urbanization, edited by Philip M. Hauser and Leo F. Schnore. New York, 1965.

27. Lewis, Oscar. "The Culture of Poverty." Scientific American, 215:4 pp. 19-25. Offprint #631.

28. Little, Kenneth. "The Migrant and the Urban Community." In Urbanism in World Perspective: A Reader, edited by Sylvia Fleis Fava. New York, 1968.

29. Mayer, Philip. Townsmen or Tribesmen: Conservatism and the Process of Urbanization in a South African City. Capetown, 1961.

30. Nash, Manning. Machine Age Maya: The Industrialization of a Guatemalan Community. American Anthropological Association, Vol. 60, No. 2, part 2. April, 1958.

31. Nash, Manning. Primitive and Peasant Economic Systems. San Francisco, 1966.

32. Nash, Manning, ed. "Social Anthropology", or Vol. 6 in The Handbook of Middle American Indians, edited by Robert Wauchope, General Editor. Austin, 1967.

33. Potter, Jack M., Diaz, May N., and Foster, George M. Peasant Society: A Reader. Boston, 1967.

34. Redfield, Robert. "The Folk Society." In Classic Essays on the Culture of Cities, edited by Richard Sennet. New York, 1969.

35. Redfield, Robert. Peasant Society and Culture: An Anthropological Approach to Civilization. Chicago, 1956.

36. Redfield, Robert. "The Social Organization of Tradition." In Peasant Society; A Reader, edited by Jack M. Potter, May N. Diaz, and George M. Foster. Boston, 1967.

37. Redfield, Robert. The Folk Culture of Yucatan. Chicago, 1942.

Rovanet, Francisco Rodriguez. "El indigena guatemalteuo: Su cultura tradicional, sus complejos problemas of posibles soluciones." In Guatemala Indigena, Vol. IV, No. 3. Instituto Indigenista Nacional. Guatemala, 1970.

Roberts, Bryan. "The Social Organization of Low-Income Urban Families." In Crucifixion by Power: Essays on Guatemalan National Social Structure, by Richard N. Adams. Austin, 1970.

38. Schwartz, Norman B. "Assimilation and Acculturation: Aspects of Ethnicity in a Guatemalan Town." Ethnology, 10:3, pp. 291-302.

39. Sennet, Richard, ed. Classic Essays on the Culture of Cities. New York, 1969.

40. Sjoberg, Gideon. "Theory and Research in Urban Sociology." In The Study of Urbanization, edited by Philip M. Hauser and Leo F. Schnore. New York, 1965.

41. Smelser, Neil J. "Toward a Theory of Modernization", in Social Change; Sources, Patterns, and Consequences, edited by Amatai Etzioni and Eva Etzioni. New York, 1964.

42. Sills, David, ed. International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. New York

43. Tax, Sol, ed. Horizons of Anthropology. Chicago, 1967.

44. Tax, Sol. Penny Capitalism: A Guatemalan Indian Economy. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1953.

45. Wirth, Louis. "Rural-Urban Differences." In Classic Essays on the Culture of Cities, edited by Richard Sennet. New York, 1969.

46. Wirth, Louis. "Urbanism as a Way of Life." In Classic Essays on the Culture of Cities, edited by Richard Sennet. New York, 1969.

47. Wolf, Eric R. Peasants. Englewood Cliffs, 1966.

48. Wolf, Eric R. "Levels of Communal Relations." In The Handbook of Middle American Indians, Vol. 6, edited by Manning Nash, Volume editor and Robert Wauchope, General Editor.

DATE DUE

GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.